DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 742 HE 004 233

TITLE	Washington State University Commission on the Status of Women: Report on the Status of Faculty Women.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Univ., Pullman. Commission on the Status of Women.
PUB DATE	Feb 72
NOTE	38p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Employment Opportunities; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Equal Protection; *Higher Education; Promotion (Occupational); Salary Differentials; *Sex Discrimination; *Women Professors
IDENTIFIERS	*Washington State University

ABSTRACT

The status of women at the Washington State University (WSU) is examined. Emphasis is placed on distribution of women faculty, promotion rates, salary comparisons and participation of women faculty in positions of influence. Recommendations to enhance the position of women as WSU are listed for each area of study. A supplement to the report concerns the status of women on the WSU library faculty. (MJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078742

HE 004 235

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Report On

The Status of Faculty Women

February, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Commission acknowledges the cooperation and support of President Glenn Terrell, Executive Vice-President Wallis Beasley, and Vice-President Allan H. Smith in making this study possible. The assistance of Ms. Annette Meinhart, Administrative Assistant in the President's Office, and her staff was invaluable in the gathering and compiling of data. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. George Brain, Dean of the College of Education and Dr. Lloyd Urdal, Education Department Chairman, for providing office space for clerical help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction		1
I.	Distribution of Women Faculty	1
	A. Distribution by Appointment Classification	2
	B. Distribution by Professional Category	3
	C. Representation in Departments and Colleges or Divisions	4
	D. Representation of Women Within Academic Ranks	7
	E. Representation in Administrative Positions	9
II.	Promotion Rates	9
	A. Average Number of Years in Rank Before Promotion	9
	B. Number of Years at Present Rank	10
III.	Salary Comparisons	11
	A. Salary Comparisons for Academic Faculty	11
	B. Salary Comparisons for Library Faculty	17
	C. Salary Comparisons for Extension Faculty	17
IV.	Participation of Women Faculty in Positions of Influence	18
	A. Graduate Faculty	18
	B. University Committees	19
	C. University Senate	20
V.	Summary and Recommendations	20

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Number and Percent of Faculty by Sex and Appointment Classification	2
2.	Number and Percent of Academic Faculty by Sex and Appointment Classification	3
3.	Number and Percent of Faculty by Sex in Professional Categories	4
4.	Departments With Female Faculty on Permanent Appointment	5
5.	Departments Without Female Faculty on Permanent Appointment	6
6.	Number and Percent of Departments Within Colleges or Divisions Without Female Faculty on Permanent Appointment	7
7.	Comparison of Female and Male Permanent Full-time Faculty by Rank	7
8.	Comparison of Nonchanneled Female and Male Permanent Full-time Faculty by Rank	8
9.	Average Number of Years in Rank Before Promotion	9
10.	Percent of Male and Female Academic Faculty in Present Rank by Years	10
11.	Salary Comparisons by Rank for Permanent Full-time Academic Faculty	12
12.	Salary Comparisons Within Colleges or Division	13
13.	Salary Comparisons Within Departments for Permanent Full-time Academic Faculty	15
14.	Salary Comparisons for Library Faculty by Sex and Rank	17
15.	Salary Comparisons for Extension Faculty	18
16.	Representation on the Graduate Faculty by Sex	19
17.	University Committees Without Female Faculty, 1971-72	20

WSU Commission on the Status of Women Report:

FACULTY WOMEN

Introduction

One of the functions identified for the WSU Commission on the Status of Women when it was appointed by President Glenn Terrell in April, 1971 was to examine the status of women at the university and to make policy recommendations for change where change seemed to be indicated. The report herein contained presents findings and recommendations regarding the status of women faculty. Future reports will deal with staff women and with women students. Data for this report were obtained from anonymous computer runs of salaries by department, rank, and terminal degree and from file information furnished by the President's Office for faculty on appointment as of December, 1971.

Documents consulted were the WSU Committee Manual, 1971-72 for information regarding female representation on university committees, the Graduate Study Bulletin, 1971-1972, 1973-1974, Washington State University, for the analysis of membership on the Graduate Faculty, and a mimeographed list entitled "Washington State University Senate Roster--Faculty."

The Commission strongly urges that the administration take seriously its responsibility to develop an affirmative action plan and hopes that the findings and recommendations contained in this report will be useful in the development and implementation of such a plan for women faculty at WSU.

I. Distribution of Women Faculty

Distribution of women faculty at WSU was examined by (A) Appointment classification (permanent and temporary, full-time and part-time), (B) Professional category (teaching, extension, library, research), (C) Representation in departments and colleges, (D) Representation at various ranks, and (E) Representation in administrative positions.

Data for parts (C) and (D) above were analyzed further when only non-channeled female positions were considered. In our society, women tend to be directed toward, or "channeled" into certain limited fields and excluded or discouraged from entering or pursuing a much larger number of fields. Professions open to women at the university level typically are concentrated in fields such as home economics, women's physical education, librarianship, and nursing. Men usually are not represented in these areas, or are represented only in small numbers, because of self-exclusion from what are considered female (hence low status) occupations. On the other hand, professions occupied largely or entirely by men are so occupied not as a result of male "channeling," but as a result of the value and prestige attached to them. These valued and prestigious professions are the same

ones from which women tend to be systematically excluded. Thus, the measure of a university's or a society's commitment to women as professional persons is, to a high degree, the extent to which women are represented in (i.e., permitted to enter) "nonchanneled" fields.

A. Distribution by Appointment Classification

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of female and male faculty according to appointment classification of permanent full-time, permanent part-time, temporary full-time, and temporary part-time. Figures include only those faculty with academic, research, extension, and library appointments. Excluded are faculty holding positions in areas such as student services, general administration, and Spokane Center Nursing Education.

TABLE 1

Number and Percent of Faculty by Sex and Appointment Classification (for Academic, Extension, Research, Library)

Appointment Classification	Number		Percent	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Permanent Full-time	156	956	14.03	85.97
Permanent Part-time	13	6	68.42	31.58
Temporary Full-time	9	67	11.84	88.15
Temporary Part-time	7	10	41.18	58.82
Total	185	1039	---	---
Grand Total	1224		15.11	84.85

The largest single professional category and the one in which the largest number of women appear is the academic faculty. Table 2 shows the number and percent of women and men (including deans and department chairpersons) by appointment classification for this category. Figures do not include persons holding the title of lecturer.

TABLE 2

Number and Percent of Academic Faculty by
Sex and Appointment Classification

Appointment Classification	Number		Percent	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Permanent Full-time	77	696	9.96	90.04
Permanent Part-time	5	6	45.45	54.55
Temporary Full-time	5	39	11.40	88.60
Temporary Part-time	6	9	40.00	60.00
Total	93	750	---	---
Grand Total	843		11.03	88.97

Table 2 shows that academic faculty women are outnumbered by men in all appointment classifications. Women comprise less than 10% (9.96%) of the permanent full-time faculty. When permanent full-time and permanent part-time appointments are considered together, women comprise only 10.46% of the total. When all appointment classifications are considered together, women are represented on the academic faculty at a level of just over 11%.

B. Distribution by Professional Category

A university can demonstrate a commitment to equality of opportunity for qualified women in academe by appointing them to permanent faculty positions, full-time and part-time. Table 3 summarizes the distribution of permanent full and part-time faculty by professional category: academic, research, extension, and library.

Women constitute only 1% of the permanent research faculty and approximately 10% of the permanent teaching faculty. Although women comprise 30% of the extension faculty, virtually all of their positions are in some area of the channeled field of home economics. Similarly, the high percentage of female library faculty (52%) would be expected since librarianship is also a channeled field for women.

TABLE 3

Number and Percent of Faculty by Sex in Professional Categories
(Permanent Full-time and Part-time)

Professional Category	Number		Percent	
	Female	Male	Female	Male
Academic (teaching)	82	702	10.46	89.54
Research	1	92	1.08	98.54
Extension	63	146	30.14	69.86
Library	24	22	52.17	47.83
Total	170	962	-----	-----
Grand Total	1132		15.01	84.98

C. Representation in Departments and Colleges or Divisions

Data on the distribution of faculty women, permanent full and part-time by department, are displayed in Table 4. Table 5 shows departments without permanent female faculty.

The column in both tables headed "Percent Female Doctorates Nationally" refers to the percent of women, nationally, who received doctorates in the field in 1967-68.[1] In Tables 4 and 5, the broken line (----) indicates that information for the given field was not available, or no women doctorates were reported for that year.

Of the 51 departments for which data were analyzed, women hold permanent faculty appointments in 22 (43.14%) of them. When the female channeled departments of Foods and Nutrition, Child and Family Studies, Clothing and Interior Design, and Physical Education for Women are omitted,[2] women on permanent appointment account for 11.99% of the permanent faculty in departments in which women are represented. Percentages of women in these departments range from 66.67% (Office Administration) to 4.55% (Sociology).

---

[1]Hooper, Mary E. and Chandler, Marjorie O. Earned Degrees Conferred: 1967-68 Part A - Summary Data. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics, May 1969.

[2]In order to make equitable comparisons, Physical Education for Men is also omitted.

TABLE 4

Departments with Female Faculty on Permanent Appointment

Department	Number		Total	Percent Female	Percent Female Doctorates Nationally
	Female	Male			
Foods, Nutrition	11	0	11	100	78.6
Child & Family Studies	8	1	9	88.88	46.4
Clothing, Interior Design	5	2	7	71.43	----
Office Administration	4	2	6	66.67	----
*Physical Education	14	21	35	40.00	----
Food Science Technology	2	5	7	28.57	5.0
Foreign Languages	6	17	23	26.09	28.9
Education	9**	36	45	20.00	20.3
Psychology	4	20	24	16.67	22.5
Bacteriology	1	8	9	11.11	17.0
English	4	33	37	10.81	27.4
Music	2	18	20	10.00	14.5
Mathematics	2	24	26	7.69	6.0
Political Science	1	13	14	7.14	11.4
Business Administration	2	27	29	6.90	----
Anthropology	1	15	16	6.25	23.9
Speech	1	15	16	6.25	18.5
Veterinary Clinical Medicine	1	15	16	6.25	----
Electrical Engineering	1	16	17	5.88	----
Animal Science	1	16	17	5.88	.78
History	1	21	22	4.76	13.0
Sociology	1	22	23	4.55	18.5

*Includes Department of Physical Education for Women and Department of Physical Education for Men.

**Includes three women in the channeled field of Home Economics Education.

TABLE 5

Departments Without Female Faculty on Permanent Appointment

Department	Number Perm. Faculty	Percent Female Doctorates Nationally	Department	Number Perm. Faculty	Percent Female Doctorates Nationally
Chemistry	28	8.0	Computer Science	10	----
*Economics	24	8.0	Horticulture	10	2.9
Ag. Economics	19	2.6	Vet. Microbiology	9	----
Civil Engineering	18	----	Ag. Engineering	7	----
Physics	18	2.6	Geology	7	2.4
Agronomy	17	----	Philosophy	7	9.1
Architecture	16	----	Plant Pathology	7	4.2
Mechanical Engineering	16	.25	Vet. Anatomy	7	----
Zoology	16	14.9	Entomology	6	7.6
Fine Arts	14	25.0	Vet. Physiology	6	----
Communications	13	15.6	Chemical Engineering	5	----
Forestry	13	----	Metallurgy	5	----
Botany	12	9.7	Police Science	5	----
Pharmacy	11	10.2	Genetics	3	17.3
Vet. Pathology	11	----			

*A female who holds part of her appointment in this department appears in Table 4 in Business Administration.

Table 6 summarizes by College or Division the number of departments and percent of departments within the college or division which have no female faculty on permanent appointment.

TABLE 6

Number and Percent of Departments Within Colleges or Divisions Without Female Faculty on Permanent Appointment

College or Division	Number Departments	Number Without Women	Percent Without Women
Home Economics	3	0	0
*Education	1	0	0
Social Sciences	6	1	16.67
Business Administration	3	1	33.33
Humanities	7	3	42.86
Biology and Physics	9	7	77.78
Veterinary Medicine	5	4	80.00
Agriculture	9	7	83.33
Engineering	6	5	83.33
Pharmacy	1	1	100.00

*Departments of Physical Education for Women and Physical Education for Men are omitted.

D. Representation of Women Within Academic Ranks

Table 7 displays comparative data on male and female faculty within academic ranks.

TABLE 7

Comparison of Female and Male Permanent Full-time Faculty by Rank (Academic)

Rank	Sex	Number	Percent By Sex	Percent Total Faculty by Rank	Percent Total Faculty Female and Male
Professor	F	10	12.99	3.99	1.29
	M	241	34.63	96.01	31.18
Associate Professor	F	27	35.07	11.59	3.49
	M	206	29.60	88.41	26.65
Assistant Professor	F	35	45.45	12.68	4.53
	M	241	34.63	87.32	31.18
Instructor	F	5	6.50	38.46	.65
	M	8	1.14	61.54	1.03
Total	F	77	-----	-----	9.96
	M	696	-----	-----	90.04

Less than 13% of all female academic faculty (permanent full-time) hold the rank of full professor while almost 35% of all male academic faculty (permanent full-time) occupy the highest academic rank. Women comprise less than 4% of the total number of full professors. To make another comparison, male full professors comprise 31%, or almost 1/3 of the total full-time permanent academic faculty and female full professors comprise only 1%.

The largest proportion of women faculty are at the assistant professor level (45.4%) while male faculty are evenly distributed (34.6%) at full professor and assistant professor ranks. At associate professor level, the higher percent of total women compared with percent of total men (35% compared with 29.6%) reflects the lower promotion rates for women (see Section II) as well as lower rank at initial appointment for women.

Comparisons were made to determine female representation at given ranks when those women who occupy positions which typically are not filled by men (positions into which women are channeled and from which men exclude themselves) are omitted. Table 8 presents comparisons within ranks by sex when channeled women (Home Economics, Home Economics Education, and Women's Physical Education) are omitted from the data.

TABLE 8

Comparison of Nonchanneled Female and
Male Permanent Full-Time Faculty by Rank (Academic)*

Rank	Sex	Number	Percent Total Faculty by Sex	Percent Total Faculty by Rank	Percent Total Nonchanneled Faculty Female and Male
Professor	F	5	13.51	2.07	.70
	M	237	35.11	97.93	33.29
Associate Professor	F	12	32.43	5.58	1.69
	M	203	30.07	94.42	28.51
Assistant Professor	F	18	48.65	7.26	2.53
	M	230	34.07	92.74	32.30
Instructor	F	2	5.41	28.57	.28
	M	5	.74	71.43	.70
Total	F	37	-----	-----	5.20
	M	675	-----	-----	94.80

*In order to make an equitable comparison, Physical Education for Men is omitted from the total faculty figure.

When comparisons are made between nonchanneled women and male permanent full-time academic faculty, it is apparent that women occupy a still smaller proportion of positions at each rank. Nonchanneled women comprise just over 2% of the full professor, 5.6% of associate professor rank, and 7% of assistant professor rank. When the total number of women in fields other than those into which women are directed and which men tend not to select is considered, women comprise only 5.2% of the total permanent academic faculty.

E. Representation in Administrative Positions

Of eight academic deans, one (12.5%) is female. Of a total of 53 department chairpersons, four (7.54%) are female. All five women occupying administrative academic positions are in channeled fields.

II. Promotion Rates

Data regarding comparative promotion rates for female and male academic faculty were analyzed by average number of years in rank before promotion and by number of years at present rank.

A. Average Number of Years in Rank Before Promotion

Table 9 shows average number of years in rank by terminal degree and sex for all persons who had occupied and had been promoted out of the ranks of instructor, assistant professor, and associate professor.

TABLE 9

Average Number of Years in Rank Before Promotion
(Permanent Full-time Academic Faculty)

Degree	Sex	Number	Average Number of Years in Rank
Instructor Rank			
Doctorate	F	7	3.29
	M	137	2.87
Master's	F	21	5.38
	M	46	4.04
Bachelor's	F	2	18.0
	M	2	4.5
Assistant Professor			
Doctorate	F	15	7.13
	M	273	4.56
Master's	F	12	8.98
	M	49	6.20
Bachelor's	F	--	----
	M	3	9.33
Associate Professor			
Doctorate	F	4	6.00
	M	172	5.89
Master's	F	1	7.00
	M	25	6.96
Bachelor's	F	--	----
	M	3	7.33

At all ranks and at all terminal degree levels, the promotion rate for female faculty is slower than for male faculty. The explanation that differences in terminal degrees account for slower promotion rates for women at given ranks does not hold. While a higher percent of male academic faculty hold the doctorate (66.67% compared with 45.45% of women), a much higher percent of males with the doctor's degree occupy the full professor rank (45.88% compared with 25% of female doctorates).

B. Number of Years at Present Rank

Table 10 shows by five-year intervals the percent of male and female faculty in the category at the present ranks of assistant and associate professor.

TABLE 10

Percent of Male and Female Academic Faculty in Present Rank by Years

Years in Rank	Percent of Females	Percent of Males
Assistant Professor With Doctorate		
0- 5	60.00	97.13
6-10	40.00	2.30
11-	-----	.57
Assistant Professor With Master's		
0- 5	86.36	87.30
6-10	13.64	11.11
11-15	-----	-----
16-	-----	1.59
Associate Professor With Doctorate		
0- 5	62.50	83.81
6-10	25.00	13.87
11-16	6.25	1.16
16-	6.25	1.16
Associate Professor With Master's		
0- 5	27.27	40.62
6-10	36.36	40.62
11-16	36.36	12.50
16-	-----	6.25

For both ranks and at both terminal degree levels, a higher percent of men than women occupy the lower (0-5 years) interval. This is especially marked at the doctoral level where female assistant and associate professors are represented at the levels of 60% and 62.5% respectively, compared with 97.13% and 87.30% for men. At all other intervals except one, the percent for women is greater than for men, indicating that a higher proportion of women have been at their present rank for a longer period of time. Particularly striking is the 6-10 year interval for assistant professors with the doctorate where 40% of females appear compared with 2.3% of males.

III. Salary Comparisons

All salary figures herein reported are for an academic year. Salary comparisons were made for full-time permanent faculty as follows: (A) Academic (Teaching), (B) Library, and (C) Extension. No salary analysis was made for Research Faculty because no female appeared in that category on the computer printout. Academic Faculty salaries were analyzed further according to rank and terminal degree for (1) total faculty, (2) college or division, and (3) department. College, division, and departmental comparisons were made only for those in which both female and male faculty appeared on the computer printout.

Salary figures include professorial salary (total salary minus increment for administrative duties) only for department chairpersons on academic appointment. Chairpersons on annual appointment are excluded because at the time the computer run was made, professorial salaries for such persons were not available. Deans' salaries do not appear in these figures.

Annual salaries were combined with academic salaries using the standard .8181 conversion figure. This was felt to be appropriate although the university uses the higher figure of .8625 in converting individual salaries. It should be noted that the effect of excluding professorial salaries of department chairpersons on annual appointment (all of whom are male) plus the use of the lower conversion figure for regular annual appointments (most of whom are male) is to present a conservative picture of average male salaries. Thus, in numerous instances, reported discrepancies between female and male salaries are actually greater in favor of men than is indicated.

In Tables 11-15 which follow, differentials in mean salary between females and males at comparable ranks and terminal degrees are reported in the last column with a plus (+) indicating a higher mean for women and a minus (-) indicating a lower mean for women. No individual salaries are reported. When only one person appears in a category, an asterisk (*) replaces the mean salary figure for both sexes. When only two individuals are employed in a category, the @ symbol appears in the range column for the two persons.

A. Salary Comparisons for Academic Faculty

1. Salary comparisons for total faculty

Table 11 displays salary comparisons by rank and terminal degree for full-time permanent faculty as listed on the computer printout.

TABLE 11

Salary Comparison by Rank for Permanent Full-time Academic Faculty

	Female				Male				Differential
	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	
Full Professor									
Doctorate	8	16207	15053-17411	11.9	190	17667	12272-26725	15.9	-1460
Master's	1	*		24.0	23	*	11485-20450	22.3	-1603
Bachelor's	0	-----	----------	----	3	15425	13905-16827	20.3	-----
Associate Professor									
Doctorate	15	13122	12051-15056	12.0	174	13142	9408-19634	7.6	-20
Master's	12	12711	11675-14445	20.2	32	12969	10661-15375	13.3	-258
Bachelor's	0	-----	----------	----	1	*		24.0	-----
Assistant Professor									
Doctorate	10	11110	10000-12850	4.4	156	12010	9500-15748	3.0	-900
Master's	20	10346	9198-11960	5.7	79	10518	7725-13600	3.8	-172
Bachelor's	4	10657	10176-11053	9.7	2	12000	@	2.3	-1343
Instructor									
Doctorate	0	-----	----------	----	2	10000	@	1.0	-----
Master's	4	9059	8262-9500	4.5	4	9366	7935-11125	1.2	-307
Bachelor's	1	*		1.0	0	-----	----------	----	-----

Of the eight rank comparisons of mean salaries involving both sexes and controlled for terminal degree, all differences between means are in favor of men. Salaries of women within a category range from $20 to $1603 per year less than those of males. For every comparison except one, the average number of years at WSU is greater for women than for men.

2. Salary Comparisons Within Colleges or Divisions

Salary comparisons for females and males by rank and terminal degree are displayed in Table 12.

TABLE 12

Salary Comparisons Within Colleges or Division
(Permanent Full-time Academic Faculty)

College or Division	Female				Male				Differential
	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	
Professor With Doctorate									
Agriculture	1	*		17.0	32	*	12272-22580	15.3	-165
Biological Sciences	1	*		27.0	18	*	15135-22600	19.9	-3620
Economics & Business	1	*		13.0	17	*	14700-26725	18.4	-4047
Education	2	17026	@	5.5	15	16750	14040-21810	12.9	+276
Social Sciences	2	16600	@	9.5	29	18666	14111-26000	14.9	-2066
Professor With Master's									
Humanities	1	*		24.0	11	*	11485-19158	19.7	-1081
Associate Professor With Doctorate									
Education	6	12908	12051-13600	16.0	11	13079	12200-15180	7.6	-171
Home Economics	5	*	12272-15056	8.0	1	*		5.0	+486
Humanities	1	*		15.0	25	*	11330-16000	7.7	+921
Social Sciences	3	12900	12700-13100	12.7	21	13490	12103-15550	5.1	-590
Associate Professor With Master's									
Economics & Business	2	12050	@	21.5	3	12636	11433-13875	15.7	-586
Education	2	*	@	22.0	1	*		14.0	-25
Humanities	2	12688	@	21.5	9	12488	10661-14500	9.8	+200

TABLE 12, Continued

College or Division	Female				Male				Differential
	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	
Assistant Professor With Doctorate									
Physical Sciences	1	*		3.0	31	*	10800-13800	3.1	-795
Education	3	10909	10326-11400	2.0	12	11506	11200-12480	2.7	-597
Engineering	1	*		5.0	13	*	11249-14000	3.0	+374
Humanities	3	10733	10000-11400	4.3	23	10764	9500-13000	3.6	-31
Social Sciences	1	*		10.0	32	*	10400-14201	2.9	+801
Assistant Professor With Master's									
Economics & Business	2	10288	@	6.0	5	12065	10500-13600	1.6	-1777
Education	8	10575	9579-11960	5.2	11	11362	10226-15544	7.2	-787
Humanities	3	10242	9600-10625	5.3	22	10824	7725-13500	2.8	-582
Social Sciences	1	*		0.0	11	*	10400-12900	1.8	+423
Instructor With Master's									
Agriculture	1	*		4.0	1	*		3.0	+327
Education	1	*		3.0	3	*	8590-11126	1.0	-369

Of the 24 mean salary comparisons, 66.7% (16) are in favor of men. It might be speculated that this salary advantage is a function of longer years of service for men. This is not the case, however, since in 11 (68.8%) of these comparisons, the average number of years at WSU is greater for women. On the other hand, in the eight comparisons favoring women, longer years in service do, indeed, seem to play a role, since the average number of years at WSU is greater for them in 75% of the cases. Thus, it appears that if there is a salary advantage for women, it is tied to length of time in service.

The range of the mean salary differential when females lag behind but have been at WSU longer than males is $25 - $3620.

3. Salary Comparisons Within Departments

Twenty-eight departments were shown in which female and male permanent full-time faculty were employed. Table 13 presents comparisons between mean salaries by sex when controlled for rank and terminal degree.

TABLE 13

Salary Comparisons Within Departments for Permanent Full-time Academic Faculty

Department	Female				Male				Differential
	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	
Professor With Doctorate									
Bacteriology & Public Health	1	*		27.0	3	*	15825-21450	17.0	-2875
Business Administration	1	*		13.0	7	*	14850-23800	20.2	-3468
Education	1	*		2.0	12	*	14040-21810	12.8	-112
Food Science & Technology	1	*		15.0	1	*		16.0	+327
Psychology	2	16600	@	9.5	10	17576	14111-24750	13.2	-976
Physical Education	1	*		9.0	3	*	14678-18450	12.7	+668
Professor With Master's									
English	1	*		23.0	1	*		24.0	-850
Associate Professor With Doctorate									
Business Administration	1	*		3.0	8	*	10963-16561	8.2	+74
Child & Family Studies	2	*	@	4.5	1	*		5.0	+425
Education	2	12475	@	15.0	9	12940	12200-15180	8.0	-465
Foreign Languages	1	*		15.0	7	*	11845-15700	8.1	+1179
Political Science	1	*		10.0	4	*	12360-14000	6.0	-340
Psychology	1	*		24.0	2	*	@	3.5	-297
Physical Education	4	13125	12051-13600	16.5	2	13705	@	6.0	-580
Sociology	1	*		4.0	4	*	13081-15550	5.3	-1866

TABLE 13, Continued

Department									Differential
	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	
Associate Professor With Master's									
Music	1	*		19.0	2	*	@	18.0	-563
Assistant Professor With Doctorate									
Education	1	*		3.0	9	*	11200-12480	2.0	-146
Electrical Engineering	1	*		5.0	4	*	11249-14000	4.3	+494
English	2	10700	@	3.5	11	10136	9500-10750	3.6	+564
Foreign Languages	1	*		6.0	3	*	10600-11550	5.3	-250
History	1	*		10.0	6	*	10400-11100	2.8	+1250
Mathematics	1	*		3.0	10	*	10500-12900	2.5	-645
Physical Education	2	10663	@	1.0	3	11383	11300-11500	4.7	-720
Assistant Professor With Master's									
Clothing & Textiles, Interior Design	2	10438	@	9.0	2	10400	@	3.0	+38
Education	4	10870	10200-11960	5.0	3	10775	10226-11100	1.0	+95
English	1	*		3.0	3	*	10000-11000	1.3	-750
Instructor With Master's									
Animal Sciences	1	*		4.0	1	*		3.0	+327

Of 28 mean salary comparisons, 60.7% (17) are in favor of men. In 58.8% of the comparisons favoring men, however, the average number of years at WSU for women is greater. Of the 11 comparisons where mean salaries favor women, women have been at WSU longer, on the average, in 53.6% of the cases. Mean salary differences when women lag behind men but have been at WSU longer range from $146-$2875.

B. Salary Comparisons for Library Faculty

Table 14 displays a summary of Library faculty salary data by sex and rank. Librarian 4, 3, 2, and 1 compare with academic ranks of full, associate, assistant professor and instructor. Administrators are excluded from the figures. Categories include only those in which both males and females are employed.

TABLE 14

Salary Comparisons for Library Faculty by Sex and Rank
(Includes Audio-Visual)

Rank	Female				Male				Differential
	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	
4	1	*		12.0	3	*	12435-12844	10.7	-3018
3	2	9531	@	7.0	3	10772	9245-12026	12.0	-1241
2	5	7267	6741-7752	4.6	6	8009	6741- 8590	1.3	-742
1	5	6741	6627-7281	1.4	3	6899	6790- 6954	1.5	-158

Average salary differentials are in favor of men in all categories. Average number of years at WSU is greater for women for Librarians 4 and 2 and virtually equal for Librarian 1. Differentials in favor of men where women show, on the average, longer years at WSU range from $158 - $3018.

C. Salary Comparisons for Extension Faculty

Salary comparisons for extension faculty by sex with rank and terminal degree controlled are presented in Table 15. Ranks designated as E-4, E-3, E-2, and E-1 are comparable to full professor, associate professor, assistant professor, and instructor.

Although the salary differential is in favor of males in six out of seven comparisons (85.7%), it must be noted that the average number of years at WSU is greater for males. In the E-2 category, however, the difference in average number of years at WSU is very small although the salary differentials in favor of males at both terminal degree levels are substantial. In four out of six comparisons of the salary range, the lowest salary within the category is higher for males than is the comparable lowest salary figure for females.

TABLE 15

Salary Comparisons for Extension Faculty

Degree	Female				Male				Differential
	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. USU	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. USU	
				E-4					
Doctorate	1	*		3.0	8	*	12861-15953	14.9	+1859
				E-3					
Master's	12	11049	9654-12762	11.0	30	12294	9817-15135	14.3	-1245
Bachelor's	4	10922	9654-12190		10	11527	9817-15135		-605
				E-2					
Master's	9	8763	7363-11044	9.5	22	9410	7445-11862	10.1	-647
Bachelor's	12	9285	8017-10881		27	10090	7363-12272		-805
				E-1					
Master's	3	7172	6954- 7281	2.5	4	7833	6954- 8918	14.3	-711
Bachelor's	20	6839	6218- 8590		5	8197	7445- 8917		-1358

IV. Participation of Women Faculty in Positions of Influence

The influence which a person or group is able to exert on its own behalf or on behalf of others is often a function of the extent to which the person or group has access to individuals who make up the power structure. Section IV seeks to determine the degree to which women have access to the power structure by examining their participation in three important university bodies: the Graduate Faculty, University Committees, and the University Senate.

A. Graduate Faculty

In some departments, favorable tenure consideration, as well as promotion and salary increases, are closely tied to election to the Graduate Faculty. Graduate Faculty members are more likely to have the assistance of graduate students in their research projects, thus enhancing opportunities for published research leading to faster promotion rates and salary increases. Table 16 presents the number and percent of men and women on the Graduate Faculty and the percent of total faculty by sex on the Graduate Faculty.

TABLE 16

Representation on the Graduate Faculty by Sex

Sex	Number	Percent Total Grad. Faculty	Percent Total F/M Faculty
Female	22	3.79	12.89
Male	558*	96.21	58.00

*Excluding members of the Central Administration.

Of a total of 580 members of the Graduate Faculty, 22 (3.79%) are women and 558 (96.21%) are men. Of the total number of female faculty (permanent full and part-time), 12.89% are on the Graduate Faculty compared with 58.00% for men. The explanation that a smaller proportion of female than male faculty hold the doctorate (66.67% compared with 45.4% for academic faculty) does not seem sufficient to explain the small proportion of female Graduate Faculty members. Of the men on Graduate Faculty, 6.61% (37) do not hold the doctorate; only 4.5% (1) of the women are without the doctoral degree.

B. University Committees

Of 47 university standing committees, faculty women are represented on 59.57% (28) of them, according to the 1971-72 Committee Manual. There are no committees without male faculty representatives. The 30 different faculty women on committees include 26 from the teaching faculty, 3 librarians, and 2 from student services.

Of the 40 committee positions held by the 30 faculty females, 3 positions represent channeled fields and 4 are ex officio. This leaves only 33 positions filled by females selected from the pool of faculty women available university-wide. Only three committees are chaired by female faculty.

Table 17 displays the names and total membership of the committees without faculty women in 1971-72. An examination of the Committee Manuals for 1969-70 and 1970-71 shows no faculty women represented on the committees for those years as well, with the exception of the Curriculum Innovations Committee which was not listed in the 1969-70 manual.

TABLE 17

University Committees Without Female Faculty, 1971-72

Committee	Number of Members	Committee	Number of Members
Curriculum Innovations	3	Patent Committee	7
Catalog Subcommittee of EPC	7	Planning Council	13
Building Names	5	Subcommittee on Physical Facilities	6
Health and Safety	12	Policy and Projects Committee of the Scholarship Development Fund	7
Invited Addresses	4	Radio-TV Advisory Committee	9
Isotopes	3	Traffic Control Board	8
Lab Animals	6	University Publications Board	7
Library Advisory	9	Honors Council	7
Military Education	8		
Museum Administration	8		

C. University Senate

Members of the University Senate are elected rather than appointed; thus there may be somewhat different considerations involved in the representation of women faculty in that body. Of the 75 faculty senators, 8 (10.67%) are female. This figure includes 4 from the channeled fields of physical education for women and home economics. One of the 2 library senators is female. When omitting the above constituencies[1] from total senate faculty representation, nonchanneled women faculty represent only 4.41% of the faculty membership on the University Senate. Since nonchanneled women constitute 5.2% of the academic faculty, the former figure may be a reflection of the extent to which women are given serious consideration by those who elect persons to the decision-making bodies of the university.

V. Summary and Recommendations

In considering the status of faculty women at WSU, four major areas were examined: distribution, rates of promotion, salaries, and participation in positions of influence. Also examined were tenure considerations and length of time in service for full-time temporary faculty. A summary of main findings for each area is presented below. The recommendations which follow refer to specific matters dealt with in the body of the report as well as to considerations of a more general nature related to these matters.

[1]The senator from Physical Education for Men is also omitted in order to make equitable comparisons.

Summary

Distribution

Women constitute approximately 15% of the teaching, research, library, and extension faculty in temporary, permanent, full and part-time appointments. This figure is well below the national average of 18-22% for women on college and university faculties. In permanent full and part-time positions, females comprise 1% of the research faculty, 10.46% of the teaching faculty, 30% of extension, and 52% of the library faculty. When women in "channeled" fields are omitted, only 5.2% of the teaching faculty is female.

At the administrative level, females comprise 12.5% of the deans and 7.5% of the department chairpersons. All five of these women are in channeled fields. Women are underrepresented at the administrative level in all positions, including as directors of special programs. It should be noted, however, that although there are no women at the top administrative level in the library, the large pool of available women on its faculty has been tapped so that the chiefs of the three main divisions (humanities, social science, and science) presently are female.

Of 53 academic departments, 43% contain no women on permanent appointment, either full or part-time. Half of the colleges or divisions examined have more than 50% of their departments without female permanent faculty.

Within academic faculty ranks, women comprise 3.99% of the full professors, 11.59% of associate professors, and 12.68% of assistant professors. Less than one-half of all the permanent academic women are at the upper ranks of full and associate professor while almost two-thirds of the men hold those ranks. Women at the upper ranks comprise less than 5% of the total academic faculty. When nonchanneled women are considered, females comprise 2.07% of full professors, 5.58% of associate professors, and 7.26% of assistant professors.

No clear-cut pattern emerged regarding tenure or regarding length of time in service for full-time temporary faculty.

Promotion Rates

For permanent academic faculty, promotion rates for women at all ranks are slower than for men when controlled for terminal degree. The discrepancy is particularly marked at the assistant professor rank where women with doctorates are at rank an average of 2.57 years longer than males. With the master's degree, women are at rank an average of 2.78 years longer than their male counterparts. At the instructor rank, there is an average discrepancy of 13.5 years between men and women at the bachelor's level, 2.34 years at the master's level, and .42 years at the doctoral level. Female associate professors with the doctorate lag an average of .11 years behind men in promotion and those with the master's degree lag .04 years behind. When examination was made of the average number of years at present rank for assistant and associate professors, it was shown that in all comparisons except one, a higher percent of women than men are at rank in the 6-10 years interval and, where women are represented, at the interval of 11 or more years.

Salary

Salary comparisons by sex with rank and terminal degree controlled were made for academic (teaching) and extension permanent full-time faculty and for library faculty with rank controlled. Academic faculty salaries were compared by rank for total faculty as well as by college or division, and by department for those in which both sexes were represented. The majority of comparisons show a salary discrepancy in favor of men when controlled for rank and terminal degree. In comparisons where the discrepancy is in favor of men, it was found that women have been at WSU more years, on the average, in 56 to 75% of comparisons. Factors other than rank, time of service, and terminal degree appear to affect salaries for men at WSU to a much greater extent than women.

Participation in Positions of Influence

Women are represented on the Graduate Faculty in the proportion of 3.79%. Of the total permanent full and part-time women, 12.89% are on the Graduate Faculty compared with 58% for men. Of 47 university committees, women are represented on 59.59% of them. There are no university committees without male representation. Women chair 3 of the committees. In the University Senate, 10% of the faculty representatives are female. When channeled persons are omitted, the female representation drops to 4.41%.

Recommendations

Distribution

1. Goals and timetables need to be set for increasing the number of faculty women. The administration should assume a positive leadership role to assure that departments undertake self-study leading to female faculty representation consistent with national availability. An approach might be to examine data such as are presented in Tables 4 and 5. Thus a department such as Chemistry which currently is shown as employing no permanent female faculty would set as a goal the recruitment of at least 2 (8% of 29) female faculty. Similarly, departments such as Economics, Zoology, and Pharmacy would strive for female faculty representation at the levels of 2, 2-3, and 1, respectively. Departments with females on appointment should examine their status with respect to additional female faculty necessary to reach a similar employment goal.

2. At the time recommendations for employment are made, information should be presented documenting contacts made and responses directed toward the intensive and methodical recruitment of faculty women. Channels other than the traditional ones should be utilized. Chapters of NOW (National Organization for Women), Women's Caucuses, and college and university commissions on the status of women have begun to compile files of credentials of qualified women. The administration should make itself aware of such sources and make this information available with the expectation that it will be utilized by colleges and departments.

3. Steps should be taken to insure that administrators of all employing units and members within those units are aware that the nepotism rule no longer exists and that consideration must be given to all qualified applicants regardless of family relationships. Literature regarding vacancies should clearly indicate that WSU does not have a nepotism rule.

4. Women should be actively encouraged to pursue advanced training in fields in which they are grossly underrepresented, such as in the sciences and in research. One means of encouragement would be for the administration to provide teaching assistantships earmarked for women graduate students with high potential in these fields.

5. Women should be represented in top administrative positions (central administration, department chairpersons, directors, etc.) in proportion to their representation on faculty and staff.

   a. All units on campus should be urged to identify and encourage women with administrative potential. As was indicated in the body of this report, if women are given greater access to decision-making positions (committee membership, etc.), their experience will be enhanced and their potential can more readily be documented.

   b. If the university does indeed aspire to be an "Equal Opportunity Employer" as its literature indicates, then it should examine policies and practices with regard to providing the administrative experience prerequisite to qualification for administrative positions. Concurrently, a vigorous educational program should be undertaken to modify the traditional attitudes toward sex role and leadership which militate against women receiving favorable consideration for administrative positions.

   c. Women should be actively recruited for administrative training. Females should be included among the candidates recommended for programs such as the American Council on Education academic administration internship program.

Promotion Rates

1. Promotion rates, practices and procedures, for both men and women should be carefully reviewed at the departmental and college levels. There is a growing body of research evidence to indicate that women are treated differently with regard to both salary and promotion when factors such as degree, experience, and publications are held constant.[1,2] Loeb and

---

[1]Henderson, Jean C. G. "Women as College Teachers." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1967.

[2]Simon, Rita J. and Rosenthal, Evelyn. "Profile of the Woman Ph.D. in Economics, History, and Sociology," American Association of University Women Journal 60, March 1967, pp. 127-29.

Ferber[1] used as indices seven types of publications, years of experience, and honors received to predict promotion rate. Interaction was found between sex and type of publication, but most of the advantages of the interaction benefited males. Particularly significant was the fact that technical (grant) reports tended to be rewarded for men to a higher degree than for women. The authors of the study speculate that technical reports are evidence of visibility outside the institution and thus are correlated with outside offers for men. Women are less likely to have outside offers under the same circumstances because of the general tendency to discriminate against women in employment and because of the limitations on mobility for married women. The statement in the current faculty manual (1971), "change in rank and salary will not be made to meet the competitive offer of another institution" (p. 27), should be strictly observed. For reasons stated above, women are less likely to have outside offers regardless of their qualifications.

2. Administrators should take positive steps to assure that women are informed of the reward system within the unit to which they are attached. This is particularly critical because, due to common social contact patterns within departments, women tend not to have access to grapevine information that may directly or indirectly affect promotability.

3. At the time that candidates are recommended for promotion, administrators should be prepared to review in detail the promotion status of women faculty in their departments. Where promotion of males is documented with reference to activities related to involvement in funded projects, positions of responsibility, etc., information should be presented regarding positive steps being taken to insure that women are encouraged to the same degree to have equal access to opportunities leading to advancement.

Salary

In addition to the numerous survey studies at colleges and universities documenting salary differentials between male and female faculty, a number of statistically sophisticated reports have shown that when women are equivalent to men in terms of all professional variables included in a regression equation, they can still expect to earn less than men.[2,3] On the basis of such evidence and the results of the study herein reported, the following recommendations are made:

1. Salary status for women should be carefully reviewed in much the same manner as promotion procedures.

---

[1]Loeb, Jane and Ferber, Marianne. "Sex as Predictive of Salary and Status on a University Faculty." Journal of Educational Measurement, Volume 8, No. 4, Winter 1971, pp. 235-244.

[2]Loeb and Ferber, Ibid.

[3]Berry, Sara and Erenburg, Mark. "Earnings of Professional Women at Indiana University." Indiana University, Bloomington, 1969, 21 pp. ED 043 292.

2. Administrators should be urged to identify and correct salary inequities where they exist.

3. Women should be informed of the nature of the financial reward system within their department.

4. At the time of annual review for salary increases, the salary status of each female faculty member should be detailed with the goal of determining the steps being taken to enable women to participate equitably with men in the financial reward system.

5. Personal considerations such as marital status and professional or financial status of the husband should have no bearing on professional opportunities afforded to women or on decisions regarding salary and promotion.

6. Women should not be denied opportunities for professional activities or special appointments involving travel or absence from home on the basis of sex, marital status, or family responsibilities. There is a tendency for such decisions to be arbitrarily made without consulting the faculty woman involved. The imposition of arbitrary judgments based on traditional and outmoded social mores has the effect of excluding women on the basis of matters other than professional qualifications.

Positions of Influence

1. Women with potential should be encouraged to embark on activities leading to eligibility to Graduate Faculty. Cultural conditioning, social pressures, and reluctance to compete with males sometimes have the subtle effect of lowering the aspiration levels of competent women. When women are alone or in the minority in a department, they tend to be isolated from the professional stimulation and support which their male colleagues gain from one another.

2. Steps should be taken to insure that leads are given women to the same degree as men with regard to opportunities and encouragement to participate in proposal writing, research, and all other activities which channel individuals toward eligibility for Graduate Faculty.

3. With regard to committee membership, there is a tendency at colleges and universities to exclude women or to appoint them infrequently to important committees that have responsibility for policy recommendations in the areas of program, curriculum, and long-range planning. Since women faculty tend to be highly involved in teaching, it would seem to be appropriate and useful at WSU to have them represented on committees such as the Curriculum Innovations Committee, the Catalog Subcommittee of the Educational Policies Committee, Library Advisory Committee. Other committees in which women faculty ought to have representation are the Planning Council, Radio-TV Advisory Committee, Space Priorities, and the University Publications Board.

   The pool of women available for committee service should be drawn upon more widely so that a larger number of women gain experience and have the contacts afforded through committee service. In this way, the university

will benefit by capitalizing on the leadership potential of women who are now being under-utilized. One way of working toward this goal is to have larger representation of women on bodies such as the Committee on Committees.

Steps should be taken to insure that faculty women are equitably represented in the decision-making process by including them in departmental and college committees and on university committees which may not be listed in the Committee Manual.

Personnel Policies

The following recommendations are directed at personnel policies which are related to matters examined in this study:

1. Persons holding part-time permanent appointments (both men and women) should be eligible for tenure and fringe benefits. More flexibility in appointments without loss of benefits or status should be encouraged for both sexes.

2. Maternity leave should be specified on behalf of both women and men faculty. Parenthood is a joint responsibility and men should be encouraged to assume this responsibility. If women faculty are to serve as models to encourage ambitious and capable women students to pursue university work as a career, the female image figures must be permitted to pursue without penalty the same avenues for self-realization as men (i.e., marriage and parenthood) without financial or professional penalty. Without specific policy, considerations such as maternity leave are left to the discretion of individual administrators, which tends to increase the probability of inequities in individual cases.

3. Tenure regulations should be worded in such a way that their interpretation is clear. Changes in interpretations and practices should be made known directly and early to persons involved. Because of the information lag generated by the social contact patterns described earlier, women are more likely than men to be penalized when the wording of regulations lends itself to capricious interpretation.

The following recommendation is of a general nature and relates not only to the status of faculty women, but to students and staff as well:

4. The administration should assume a leadership role in calling to the attention of the university community the impact of language as a social force. Politicians have demonstrated well in recent months their ability to employ the he/she form in written and oral communication and to restructure their language so that one segment of the population is not automatically excluded. The assertion that the pronoun "he" refers to both sexes is not convincing when the referent readily becomes "men," "guys," "fellows," and other nouns which clearly indicate male gender. All too frequently, the cliche "a good man," rather than "a good person," is used to refer to the hypothetical candidate being sought to fill a position. Members of the student body are often referred to as "guys" or "fellows" when the accurate term is "students" or "people." Thus,

there is a need to sensitize the community to the traditional uses of language which have the effect of identifying the university as being exclusively male and which perpetuate and reinforce the invisible status of women.

LASTLY, the Commission recommends that a committee be appointed to include representation from the Commission on the Status of Women to work with the administration in the development and implementation of a meaningful affirmative action compliance plan for women at Washington State University.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Commission on the Status of Women,

Inga K. Kelly, Chairperson

Roy A. Johnson

Patricia Edgeworth Cunnea

Barbara Johnson

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Supplement to Report on The Status of Faculty Women

Library Faculty

May, 1972

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Supplement to Report on The Status of Faculty Women

Library Faculty

This report is a detailed study of the status of faculty women at the Washington State University Library. Of the four faculty classifications, teaching, research, extension, and library, library contains the highest proportion of women (52 percent). Since librarianship is also a "channeled" profession for women, i.e., one in which women traditionally have been encouraged to enter and which is considered somehow suitable for them, it seems appropriate to examine comparative data on men and women in this field.

Nationally, about four out of five librarians are women. In academic libraries, the proportion of male librarians tends to increase; salaries in such libraries tend to be higher and positions often carry faculty status. Even in academe, however, two out of three librarians are women.

A national study of academic librarians in 1966-67 showed that inequality between sexes is increasing rather than decreasing. According to the report, male salaries tended to surpass those of females even when educational levels were equal. It was also shown that as experience increased, the differential between male and female salaries became greater. Males were twice as likely to be found in chief librarian positions, and the salaries of men on regular librarian appointments tended to surpass salaries of women chief librarians. Schiller has identified female librarians as "the disadvantaged majority."[1]

Data Sources and Analysis

Data for the present study were obtained from:

-Anonymous computer runs of salaries by department, rank, and terminal degree.

-File information furnished by the President's Office for faculty on appointment as of December, 1971.

---

[1]Schiller, Anita R., "The Disadvantaged Majority." American Libraries, 1:345-349, April, 1970. This article was taken from Ms. Schiller's larger work: Characteristics of Professional Personnel in College and University Libraries, Illinois State Library Research Series, no. 16. Springfield, Illinois State Library, 1969.

-State of Washington, Budget, 1971-1973 Biennium. Washington State University Personnel Detail.

-File information furnished by the Library Administrative Office.

Data on full-time permanent library faculty were analyzed by sex according to distribution by rank, average number of years in rank before promotion, initial hiring rank, and salary. Average number of years at WSU as well as prior professional library experience and other relevant prior experience were calculated. Data do not include the three top library administrators, all of whom are male. Librarian 4, 3, 2, and 1 are comparable to academic ranks of full, associate, assistant professor and instructor.

Findings

Table 1 shows the distribution of permanent full-time faculty by rank and sex.

Table 1

Distribution of Female and Male Permanent Full-Time Faculty by Rank (Library, Including Audio-Visual)

Rank	Sex	Number	Percent Within Rank	Percent Total, by Sex
L-4	F	1	25	6
	M	3	75	15
L-3	F	3	27	18
	M	8	73	40
L-2	F	6	50	35
	M	6	50	30
L-1	F	7	70	41
	M	3	30	15
Total	F	17	----	46
	M	20	----	54

Table 1 shows that women are clustered in the two lower ranks. Approximately 75 percent of them are found in the ranks of Librarian 1 and Librarian 2 compared with less than 50 percent of the men. Above the ranks of Librarian 2, however, positions are filled predominantly by males. In each of the ranks of Librarian 3 and Librarian 4, approximately three out of four librarians are male. Over 50 percent of the male librarians are in the two upper ranks, Librarian 3 and Librarian 4, while only 25 percent of females are in these ranks.

Table 2 shows average number of years in rank before promotion, by sex and terminal degree.

Table 2

Average Number of Years in Rank Before Promotion
(Permanent Full-Time Library Faculty)

Degree	Sex	Number	Average Number of Years in Rank (to nearest half-year)
L-1 (Instructor)			
Doctorate	F	0	---
	M	1	1
Master's	F	6	5
	M	3	5
Bachelor's	F	1	4
	M	2	5
L-2 (Assistant Professor)			
Doctorate	F	0	---
	M	1	5
Master's	F	2	6
	M	4	6.5
Bachelor's	F	1	4
	M	2	6.5
L-3 (Associate Professor)			
Doctorate	F	0	---
	M	1	5
Master's	F	1	5
	M	2	6
Bachelor's	F	0	---
	M	0	---

In general, it appears that women librarians spend slightly less time in rank, on the average, than men. This seems to hold true at all ranks, although the data are sparse at the upper ranks as the number of women reaching these ranks diminishes.

A further analysis was made to determine the average number of years at present rank for male and female librarians. Excluding the terminal rank of Librarian 4, only one librarian has spent more than five years at present rank. This is a woman with a master's degree who has been Librarian 2 for nine years. It should be noted, however, that if this person were to be promoted, the average number of years in rank for women at L-2, Master's, would be greater (7 years rather than 6) for women than for men.

Table 3 summarizes a comparison of rank at initial hiring, and average number of years of experience, by sex.

Table 3

Rank at Initial Hiring and Prior Experience, by Sex

	FEMALE					MALE				
Degree	No.	Percent within rank	Percent by sex	Prior professional library experience (avg. yrs.)	Other relevant prior experience (yrs.)	No.	Percent within rank	Percent by sex	Prior professional library experience (avg. yrs.)	Other relevant prior experience (yrs.)
L-1 (Instructor)										
Master's	11	50	82.4	.5	7	6	27.2	50.0	1	1
Bachelor's	3	13.6		0	10	2	9.1		2.5	9.5
L-2 (Assistant Professor)										
Master's	2	28.6	11.8	1.5	6	5	71.4	31.3	3.5	3
L-3 (Associate Professor)										
Master's	1	25.0	5.8	16.5	1	3	75.0	18.8	4	8.5
Total	17					16				

Table 3 shows that 75 percent of the librarians hired at L-3 rank and 71 percent hired at L-2 rank are male compared with only 36 percent hired at the L-1 level. To make another comparison, it can be seen that 82 percent of all females were hired at the lowest (L-1) rank while only 50 percent of all males were hired at this rank. Thus it appears that rank at initial appointment is a major factor in the small representation of women at the upper ranks.

Although the library administration in its hiring policy takes into consideration previous library experience as well as other relevant experience (business, teaching, editorships, military service, etc.), no clear pattern emerges regarding the relationship between experience and initial appointment level. It might be useful to examine further the weighting of such factors in the determination of initial appointment level.

Table 4 displays salary comparisons by rank for categories in which both males and females are employed. When only one person appears in a category, an asterisk (*) replaces the mean salary figure for both sexes. When only two individuals are employed in a category, the @ symbol appears in the range column for the two persons. All salaries are annual. Average years at WSU were computed to the nearest half-year. Because their duties are not strictly administrative, division chief positions are included.

Table 4

Salary Comparison by Rank for Permanent Full-time Library Faculty

	FEMALE				MALE				
Degree	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	Differential
L-4 (Professor)									
Master's	1	*		14	2	*	@	13.5	-3,605
L-3 (Associate Professor)									
Master's	2	11,650	@	8	4	12,700	11,300-14,700	8.5	-1,050
Bachelor's	1	*		10	3	*	10,197-14,000	9.5	- 499
L-2 (Assistant Professor)									
Master's	6	9,003	8,240-9,600	6.5	5	9,708	8,240-10,500	3	- 705
L-1 (Instructor)									
Master's	5	8,260	8,000-8,900	1.5	3	8,433	8,300-8,500	1.5	- 173

A substantial salary differential between males and females is found for all comparisons and at all levels. The differential tends to increase with rank. All differentials are in favor of men and appear to be unrelated to years of service. Educational background is controlled in all comparisons. Examination of the raw data reveals that in only one case is there a woman in an upper rank with a higher salary than a comparable male.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Supplement to Report on The Status of Faculty Women

Library Faculty

May, 1972

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Supplement to Report on The Status of Faculty Women

Library Faculty

This report is a detailed study of the status of faculty women at the Washington State University Library. Of the four faculty classifications, teaching, research, extension, and library, library contains the highest proportion of women (52 percent). Since librarianship is also a "channeled" profession for women, i.e., one in which women traditionally have been encouraged to enter and which is considered somehow suitable for them, it seems appropriate to examine comparative data on men and women in this field.

Nationally, about four out of five librarians are women. In academic libraries, the proportion of male librarians tends to increase; salaries in such libraries tend to be higher and positions often carry faculty status. Even in academe, however, two out of three librarians are women.

A national study of academic librarians in 1966-67 showed that inequality between sexes is increasing rather than decreasing. According to the report, male salaries tended to surpass those of females even when educational levels were equal. It was also shown that as experience increased, the differential between male and female salaries became greater. Males were twice as likely to be found in chief librarian positions, and the salaries of men on regular librarian appointments tended to surpass salaries of women chief librarians. Schiller has identified female librarians as "the disadvantaged majority."[1]

Data Sources and Analysis

Data for the present study were obtained from:

-Anonymous computer runs of salaries by department, rank, and terminal degree.

-File information furnished by the President's Office for faculty on appointment as of December, 1971.

---

[1] Schiller, Anita R., "The Disadvantaged Majority." American Library [illegible] work: Characteristics of Professional Personnel in College and University Libraries, Illinois State Library Research Series, no. 16. Springfield, Illinois State Library, 1969.

-State of Washington, Budget, 1971-1973 Biennium. Washington State University Personnel Detail.

-File information furnished by the Library Administrative Office.

Data on full-time permanent library faculty were analyzed by sex according to distribution by rank, average number of years in rank before promotion, initial hiring rank, and salary. Average number of years at WSU as well as prior professional library experience and other relevant prior experience were calculated. Data do not include the three top library administrators, all of whom are male. Librarian 4, 3, 2, and 1 are comparable to academic ranks of full, associate, assistant professor and instructor.

Findings

Table 1 shows the distribution of permanent full-time faculty by rank and sex.

Table 1

Distribution of Female and Male Permanent Full-Time Faculty by Rank (Library, Including Audio-Visual)

Rank	Sex	Number	Percent Within Rank	Percent Total, by Sex
L-4	F	1	25	6
	M	3	75	15
L-3	F	3	27	18
	M	8	73	40
L-2	F	6	50	35
	M	6	50	30
L-1	F	7	70	41
	M	3	30	15
Total	F	17	----	46
	M	20	----	54

Table 1 shows that women are clustered in the two lower ranks. Approximately 75 percent of them are found in the ranks of Librarian 1 and Librarian 2 compared with less than 50 percent of the men. Above the ranks of Librarian 2, however, positions are filled predominantly by males. In each of the ranks of Librarian 3 and Librarian 4, approximately three out of four librarians are male. Over 50 percent of the male librarians are in the two upper ranks, Librarian 3 and Librarian 4, while only 27

Table 2 shows average number of years in rank before promotion, by sex and terminal degree.

Table 2

Average Number of Years in Rank Before Promotion
(Permanent Full-Time Library Faculty)

Degree	Sex	Number	Average Number of Years in Rank (to nearest half-year)
L-1 (Instructor)			
Doctorate	F	0	---
	M	1	1
Master's	F	6	5
	M	3	5
Bachelor's	F	1	4
	M	2	5
L-2 (Assistant Professor)			
Doctorate	F	0	---
	M	1	5
Master's	F	2	6
	M	4	6.5
Bachelor's	F	1	4
	M	2	6.5
L-3 (Associate Professor)			
Doctorate	F	0	---
	M	1	5
Master's	F	1	5
	M	2	6
Bachelor's	F	0	---
	M	0	---

In general, it appears that women librarians spend slightly less time in rank on the average, than men. This seems to hold true at all ranks, although the data are sparse at the upper ranks as the number of women reaching these ranks diminishes.

A further analysis was made to determine the average number of years at present rank for male and female librarians. Excluding the terminal rank of Librarian 4, only one librarian has spent more than five years in a rank nine years. It should be noted, however, that if this person were to be promoted, the average number of years in rank for women at L-2, Master's, would be greater (7 years rather than 6) for women than for men.

Table 3 summarizes a comparison of rank at initial hiring, and average number of years of experience, by sex.

Table 3

Rank at Initial Hiring and Prior Experience, by Sex

	FEMALE					MALE				
Degree	No.	Percent within rank	Percent by sex	Prior professional library experience (avg. yrs.)	Other relevant prior experience (yrs.)	No.	Percent within rank	Percent by sex	Prior professional library experience (avg. yrs.)	Other relevant prior experience (yrs.)
L-1 (Instructor)										
Master's	11	50	82.4	.5	7	6	27.2	50.0	1	1
Bachelor's	3	13.6		0	10	2	9.1		2.5	9.5
L-2 (Assistant Professor)										
Master's	2	28.6	11.8	1.5	6	5	71.4	31.3	3.5	3
L-3 (Associate Professor)										
Master's	1	25.0	5.8	16.5	1	3	75.0	18.8	4	8.5
Total	17					16				

Table 3 shows that 75 percent of the librarians hired at L-3 rank and 71 percent hired at L-2 rank are male compared with only 36 percent hired at the L-1 level. To make another comparison, it can be seen that 82 percent of all females were hired at the lowest (L-1) rank while only 50 percent of all males were hired at this rank. Thus it appears that rank at initial appointment is a major factor in the small representation of women at the upper ranks.

Although the library administration in its hiring policy takes into consideration previous library experience as well as other relevant experience (business, teaching, editorships, military service, etc.), no clear pattern emerges regarding the relationship between experience and initial appointment level. It might be useful to examine further the weighting of such factors in the determination of initial appointment level.

Table 4 displays salary comparisons by rank for categories in which both males and females are employed. When only one person appears in a category, an asterisk (*) replaces the mean salary figure for both sexes. When only two individuals are employed in a category, the @ symbol appears in the range column for the two persons. All salaries are annual. Average years at WSU were computed to the nearest half-year. Because their duties are not strictly administrative, division chief positions are included.

Table 4

Salary Comparison by Rank for Permanent Full-time Library Faculty

	FEMALE				MALE				
Degree	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	No.	Mean Salary	Range	Avg. Yrs. WSU	Differential
L-4 (Professor)									
Master's	1	*		14	2	*	@	13.5	-3,605
L-3 (Associate Professor)									
Master's	2	11,650	@	8	4	12,700	11,300-14,700	8.5	-1,050
Bachelor's	1	*		10	3	*	10,197-14,000	9.5	- 409
L-2 (Assistant Professor)									
Master's	6	9,003	8,240-9,600	6.5	5	9,708	8,240-10,500	3	- 705
L-1 (Instructor)									
Master's	5	8,260	8,000-8,900	1.5	3	8,433	8,300-8,500	1.5	- 173

A substantial salary differential between males and females is found for all comparisons and at all levels. The differential tends to increase with rank. All differentials are in favor of men and appear to be unrelated to years of service. Educational background is controlled in all comparisons. Examination of the raw data reveals that in only one case is there a woman in an upper rank with a higher salary than a comparable male.

Conclusions

On the basis of the analyses and observations dealt with for this report, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Female library faculty are underrepresented at the upper ranks.

2. Women are much more likely than men to be initially hired at the lowest rank.

3. When education is controlled and experience comparable, the differential in average salaries is in favor of men at all ranks.

4. There are no women in the top administrative positions in the library.

Recommendations

1. Every effort should be made to recruit and hire women at ranks above Librarian 1, the lowest rank and the one where women are concentrated. Perhaps the fact that a woman recently was hired at L-2 (Assistant Professor rank) is an indication of an awareness on the part of the administration of the need to work toward this goal.

2. Salary differentials should be reviewed and adjusted where inequities exist. Again, it is noteworthy that some concern has been shown by the library administration regarding salary inequities among library faculty, although the extent to which these differentials are related to sex may not have been perceived.

3. As top administrative positions at the WSU library become vacant, qualified female candidates should be identified. In a field in which two out of three professionals are female, it would be reasonable to have this proportion reflected in the top library administrative positions at WSU.

Respectfully submitted by the Library Sub-Committee of the WSU Commission on the Status of Women,

Nancy Porter, Chairperson
Audrey Dibble
Sylvia Fink
Betty Roberts

Joan K. Kelly, Commission Chairperson

Conclusions

On the basis of the analyses and observations dealt with for this report, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Female library faculty are underrepresented at the upper ranks.

2. Women are much more likely than men to be initially hired at the lowest rank.

3. When education is controlled and experience comparable, the differential in average salaries is in favor of men at all ranks.

4. There are no women in the top administrative positions in the library.

Recommendations

1. Every effort should be made to recruit and hire women at ranks above Librarian 1, the lowest rank and the one where women are concentrated. Perhaps the fact that a woman recently was hired at L-2 (Assistant Professor rank) is an indication of an awareness on the part of the administration of the need to work toward this goal.

2. Salary differentials should be reviewed and adjusted where inequities exist. Again, it is noteworthy that some concern has been shown by the library administration regarding salary inequities among library faculty, although the extent to which these differentials are related to sex may not have been perceived.

3. As top administrative positions at the WSU library become vacant, qualified female candidates should be identified. In a field in which two out of three professionals are female, it would be reasonable to have this proportion reflected in the top library administrative positions at WSU.

Respectfully submitted by the Library Sub-Committee of the WSU Commission on the Status of Women,

Nancy Porter, Chairperson
Audrey Dibble
Sylvia Fink
Betty Roberts

Inga K. Kelly, Commission Chairperson